

Serial No. 09/940,410

**REMARKS**

Invention I is hereby elected subject to traverse. Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9, 13 and 19-21 are generic. Claims 8, 10, 12, 14 and 15 are directed to the embodiment of Figures 2-4 and claims 16-18 are directed to the embodiment of Figures 5 and 6. If required to also elect between species, Figures 2-4 are hereby elected, also subject to traverse.

Clearly, in order to examine the methods of the present invention, it will be necessary to search for and examine each of the apparatus of the present invention at least because each such apparatus can be used to practice the method of invention I. Thus, the Examiner has not set forth any basis why the apparatus claims can not be examined simultaneously with the method claims or that any additional effort would be required. Thus, for Patent Office economics and efficiencies, it is respectfully submitted that the restriction requirement between the apparatus and method claims should be withdrawn. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Other than an indication that different embodiments are shown, the Examiner has not indicated a single reason why a restriction is proper such as but not limited to different classification, that additional effort would be required, or the like. From a simple review of issued patents, the existence of different embodiments is not and should not be grounds for requiring restriction.

Thus, for patent office efficiencies and economics, the restriction requirement between species should be withdrawn and prosecution on the merits of all claims should be undertaken. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Favorable consideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Chun-Hsien Lee

Dated: September 2, 2003

By: 

Alan D. Kamrath (Reg. No. 28,227)  
RIDER BENNETT, LLP  
333 South Seventh Street, Suite 2000  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
Tel: (612) 340-8925  
Fax: (612) 340-7900

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
SEP 03 2003

1031499-1

OFFICIAL